Application No. Applicant(s) 10/518.386 JURECZEK, KATARZYNA Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit MICAH-PAUL YOUNG 1618 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) MICAH-PAUL YOUNG. (2) Joseph Meara. (4)____. Date of Interview: 04 February 2009. c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ____ Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 4. Identification of prior art discussed: of record. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner suggested including the limitations of claim 1 into the method of claim 4, since the Declaration shows a difference in the processing of the dosage from with those specific concentrations. The Examiner suggested including product-by-process limitations to claim 1 since the Declaration shows the distinctions bare out during processing and would produce a tablet more efficiently. Applicant agreed to consult the Inventor... (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.